



COUNTY OF GOOCHLAND

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

Andrew R. McRoberts
County Attorney

Goochland County Administration Building
1800 Sandy Hook Road, Suite 310
P. O. Box 10, Goochland, Virginia 23063
(804) 556-5877 (804) 556-4369 Fax (804) 556-5317 TDD

October 7, 2008

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: WT Docket 08-165, Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify Provisions of Section 332(c)(7) to Ensure Timely Siting Review and to Preempt under Section 253 State and Local Ordinances that Classify All Wireless Siting Proposals As Requiring a Variance

COMMENTS OF GOOCHLAND COUNTY, VIRGINIA

I write on behalf of Goochland County, Virginia and its Board of Supervisors to express concerns regarding the Petition filed by CTIA. We respectfully ask that this Petition be denied.

Goochland County also supports the Opposition filed by the Coalition for Local Zoning Authority (the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and County of San Diego, CA; Town of Palm Beach, FL; City of Atlanta, GA; City of Dubuque, IA; Anne Arundel County and Montgomery, MD; Town of Southampton and City of White Plains, NY; City of Portland, OR; Henrico and City of Virginia Beach, VA). This Opposition is enclosed and incorporated herein by reference.

The deadlines set forth in CTIA's Petition are unreasonable, would require that Goochland County violate Virginia law, and would cause unintended consequences. The proposed timeframes are inadequate for a telecommunications company to properly notice and hold a balloon test after informing the community, and for Goochland County to advertise and hold public hearings required by law.

Since the adoption of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, applications for approval of conditional use permits in Goochland County have been routinely approved within a reasonable period of time, approximately 120 days in nearly all cases. We have had significant citizen buy-in to our process, and have received no complaints from telecommunications providers. All providers desiring a tower for service in Goochland have one. The current law adequately and appropriately serves the public at large. Therefore, this Petition is unfounded.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 preserved local zoning powers for good reason. The proposed changes requested in CTIA's Petition have the potential to cause detrimental impacts to future development and zoning at the local level. Local matters like land use need to be decided

Letter to Marlene H. Dortch

October 7, 2008

Page 2

at the local government level. The Commission should not sit as a national zoning board. It should not want to.

Therefore, Goochland County respectfully requests that the FCC deny CTIA's Petition and that the local zoning powers granted to localities be respected and preserved.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Andrew R. McRoberts", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Andrew R. McRoberts
County Attorney

ARM/agb

Enclosure

cc: Goochland County Board of Supervisors (w/o enclosure)
Gregory K. Wolfrey, County Administrator (w/o enclosure)

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify)	
Provisions of Section 332(c)(7) to Ensure)	
Timely Siting Review and to Preempt under)	WT Docket 08-165
Section 253 State and Local Ordinances that)	
Classify All Wireless Siting Proposals)	
As Requiring a Variance)	

**OPPOSITION OF
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AND COUNTY OF SAN
DIEGO, CA; TOWN OF PALM BEACH, FL; CITY OF ATLANTA, GA; CITY OF
DUBUQUE, IA; ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY AND MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD;
TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON AND CITY OF WHITE PLAINS, NY; CITY OF
PORTLAND, OR; HENRICO COUNTY AND CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VA

(COALITION FOR LOCAL ZONING AUTHORITY)**

Frederick E. Ellrod III
James R. Hobson
Matthew K. Schettenhelm
Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C.
1155 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-4320
(202) 785-0600

Attorneys for the Coalition for Local Zoning
Authority

September 29, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SERVE LOCAL AUTHORITIES WHOSE ACTIONS ARE “SPECIFICALLY CITED AS A BASIS FOR REQUESTING PREEMPTION.”	2
II. CONGRESS INTENDED THAT ONLY THE COURTS, NOT THE COMMISSION, INTERPRET THE SUBPARAGRAPHS OF SECTION 332(C)(7) AT ISSUE HERE.....	4
A. CTIA Has Failed to Show that Processing Times Exceeding CTIA’s Proposed Standards are Unreasonable.	6
B. The Exclusive Jurisdiction of the Courts Extends to Disputes Arising Under the “Prohibition of Service” Clause.....	10
III. THE FCC IS NOT FREE TO INTERPRET A STATUTE TO RESOLVE DISPUTES WHERE CONGRESS HAS REFUSED IT THAT AUTHORITY.	11
IV. EVEN IF THE COMMISSION COULD ENTERTAIN THE PETITION AS TO SECTION 332(C)(7), THE ALLEGATIONS PRESENTED DO NOT COMPEL FCC ACTION.....	12
A. There Is No Credible Support for CTIA’s Claim of “Egregious Delays.”	13
B. There Is No Indication that the Courts to Which Congress Assigned Dispute Resolution Under Section 332(C)(7)(B) Have Been Unfair or Derelict in Their Duties.	14
V. LOCAL ZONING VARIANCES ARE NOT, PER SE, PROHIBITIONS UNDER SECTION 253.....	15
A. Section 253 Does Not Apply to Local Authority Over Wireless Facility Siting.	15
B. Even If Section 253 Were Applicable, the FCC May Not Declare That All Local Zoning Variances that Automatically Require a Carrier to Seek a Variance Run Afoul of Section 253.....	17
1. The Plain Language of Section 253(a) Requires a Challenger to Demonstrate that a Local Requirement Prohibits, or Has the Effect of Prohibiting, its Ability to Provide Service.	18
2. CTIA Fails to Show that the Requirements in Question “Prohibit or Have the Effect of Prohibiting” a Carrier’s Ability to Provide Service.....	20
3. The Relief Requested Cannot Be Squared With Section 253(d).	22
VI. CONCLUSION.....	24

SUMMARY

The CTIA petition must be dismissed because it fails to comply with Note 1 of Section 1.1206(a), which requires service upon state or local governments whose actions are specifically cited as a basis for requesting preemption.

If not dismissed, the petition must be denied because, as to the claims under Section 332(c)(7)(B), only the courts and not the FCC may settle disputes under (B)(i)-(iii) and (v). Subparagraph (B)(iv) is not at issue here. While CTIA attempts to characterize its petition as nothing more than a request for clarification, it is plain that the petition's chief aim is the settlement of real and present disputes between CTIA members and local zoning authorities. Even if the Commission believes it possesses the authority to grant the requested relief, there is no practical way to avoid future requests to opine on the entirety of Paragraph 7 and thus to displace the courts from the exclusive role assigned them by Congress.

The petition's request for fixed 45-day and 75-day deadlines within which local zoning authorities must rule on wireless siting applications is antithetical to the unpredictable nature of the land use review process, as to which the FCC knows little. The Commission has repeatedly declined to become a national zoning board. In any event, CTIA presents no verifiable evidence that the local zoning process has been delayed unreasonably by local governments. This absence of evidence is of a piece with petitioner's refusal to identify the governments it accuses of delay and obstruction. In the pages which follow is documentation to the contrary, indicating that most wireless siting applications are processed in timely fashion when the applicant is fully engaged in the process.

With respect to the petition's claim of error under the "prohibition" language of (B)(i)(II), the same congressional reservation of authority exclusively to the courts applies to the settlement

of these disputes. Differences of interpretation of the statutory language by these courts do not change the congressional assignment of responsibility.

In any event, the differences among the courts in reading subsection (B)(i)(II) are minor by comparison with their general agreement on the meaning of “prohibition.” Almost all courts have concluded, for example, that the failure to grant a particular wireless applicant a permit must leave a “significant gap” in wireless coverage that cannot be filled by some other means. The mere fact that an applicant’s first or cheapest choice of a tower or antenna site has been disapproved is not enough.

As to the claims under Section 253, that statute may not be applied in derogation of the local zoning authority preserved by Section 332(c)(7)(A). Even if Section 253 could be applied, it sets standards – acknowledged by the FCC as well as the courts – that CTIA has made no attempt to address or meet. The petition is utterly lacking in verifiable evidence that any zoning variance procedure anywhere has prohibited, or had the effect of prohibiting, personal wireless service.

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

Petition for Declaratory Ruling to Clarify)	
Provisions of Section 332(c)(7) to Ensure)	
Timely Siting Review and to Preempt under)	WT Docket 08-165
Section 253 State and Local Ordinances that)	
Classify All Wireless Siting Proposals)	
As Requiring a Variance)	

**OPPOSITION OF
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AND COUNTY OF SAN
DIEGO, CA; TOWN OF PALM BEACH, FL; CITY OF ATLANTA, GA; CITY OF
DUBUQUE, IA; ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY AND MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD;
TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON AND CITY OF WHITE PLAINS, NY; CITY OF
PORTLAND, OR; HENRICO COUNTY AND CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, VA
(COALITION FOR LOCAL ZONING AUTHORITY)**

The City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and County of San Diego, CA; Town of Palm Beach, FL; City of Atlanta, GA; City of Dubuque, IA; Anne Arundel County and Montgomery County, MD; Town of Southampton and City of White Plains, NY; City of Portland, OR; Henrico County and City of Virginia Beach, VA (“Coalition for Local Zoning Authority” or “Coalition”) hereby move to dismiss or deny the captioned petition of CTIA – The Wireless Association® (“CTIA”) seeking clarification of two sections of the Communications Act adopted twelve years ago. The petition should be dismissed because it fails to comply with Section 1.1206(a) of the FCC’s Rules.

If not dismissed, the petition must be denied because it contravenes the intent of Congress that the courts exclusively, not the Commission, interpret all but one of the provisions

of Section 332(c)(7) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7).¹ Even where the Congress did not wholly preclude FCC interpretation, as with Section 253 of the Communications Act, the petition should be denied because it fails to state a case for Commission intervention.

I. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SERVE LOCAL AUTHORITIES WHOSE ACTIONS ARE “SPECIFICALLY CITED AS A BASIS FOR REQUESTING PREEMPTION.”

Note 1 to Section 1.1206(a) of the Commission’s Rules reads in full:

In the case of petitions for declaratory ruling that seek Commission preemption of state or local regulatory authority and petitions for relief under 47 U.S.C. 332(c)(7)(B)(v), the petitioner must serve the original petition on any state or local government, the actions of which are specifically cited as a basis for requesting preemption. Service should be made on those bodies within the state or local governments that are legally authorized to accept service of legal documents in a civil context. Such pleadings that are not served will be dismissed without consideration as a defective pleading and treated as a violation of the ex parte rules unless the Commission determines that the matter should be entertained by making it part of the record under Sec. 1.1212(d) and the parties are so informed.

The CTIA petition seeks federal preemption of state and local regulatory authority by establishing federal deadlines for action on zoning applications and “deeming” these applications granted if the federal timetables are not met. Although CTIA later described its petition as merely seeking clarification, not preemption,² it is fatuous to imagine that setting deadlines for local zoning action will constitute anything less than preemption of statutes and ordinances allowing reasonable periods that happen to be longer than those proposed by CTIA.³

¹ The one instance of jurisdiction shared between the FCC and the courts, Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv), is not at issue in the CTIA petition.

² Opposition to Motions for Extension of Time at 3 (August 26, 2008).

³ For example, Oregon’s process and timeline for review of wireless land use applications is governed by state law. ORS 227.178 provides in material part that if a city fails to take final

Moreover, the petition (at iii) specifically asks the FCC to

Preempt local ordinances and state laws that subject wireless siting applications to unique, burdensome requirements, such as those treating all wireless siting requests as requiring a variance.

Plainly, this is a request for preemption. Thus it is subject to Note 1 of Section 1.1206(a), which is not restricted to petitions seeking relief under Section 332(c)(7)(v).

The petition refers to multiple actions of local governments (Petition, 14-15, 25-27) as a basis for requesting preemption. The petition cannot evade Section 1.1206(a) by declining to identify the local governments.

Moreover, we believe that service should be made not only on those states and localities that are the subject of the petition but also on those whose actions are identified as warranting preemption. We believe that this will enhance our ability to resolve such petitions in the public interest by giving the relevant state or local governments the opportunity to respond in a timely manner to the allegations made.⁴

In addition, even before the enactment of Note 1 to Section 1.1206(a) with its particular mention of Section 332(c)(7), the Commission had established special notice requirements for petitions involving Section 253.⁵ CTIA's petition invokes Section 253 as well as Section 332 as a basis for preemption. Thus, CTIA was required to serve the targeted local governments based on Section 253 as well as Section 332.

action on a land use application within 120 days after an application is deemed complete, the applicant may apply to court for a writ of mandamus to compel approval of the application. This would presumably be preempted by CTIA's desired relief.

⁴ Memorandum Opinion and Order, GC Docket 95-21, FCC 99-322, released November 9, 1999, ¶ 29 (emphasis added).

⁵ *Id.* ("We believe that the ex parte rules should be amended to make this requirement [of service on local governments] applicable to all preemption petitions and not only for Section 253 petitions").

In short, CTIA's failure to serve its petition on local governments whose actions are specifically cited as a basis for requesting preemption means that the petition must be dismissed "without consideration as a defective pleading."⁶

II. CONGRESS INTENDED THAT ONLY THE COURTS, NOT THE COMMISSION, INTERPRET THE SUBPARAGRAPHS OF SECTION 332(C)(7) AT ISSUE HERE.

The language of Section 332(c)(7) was added by Section 704 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("TCA").⁷ It was fashioned in a conference of the House and Senate, which had produced differing versions of the TCA.⁸ The conferees decided against a House proposal for an FCC-negotiated rulemaking "to develop a uniform policy . . . for the siting of wireless tower sites." Instead, Section 332(c)(7)(A) declares resoundingly that, except for four limitations at (7)(B),

nothing in this Act shall limit or affect the authority of a State or local government or instrumentality thereof over decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities.⁹

A key passage in the Conference Report explained the alternative ultimately adopted:

It is the intent of the conferees that other than under Section 332(c)(7)(B)(iv) . . . the courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all other disputes arising under this section. Any pending Commission rulemaking concerning the preemption of local zoning authority over the

⁶ Note 1 to 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206(a).

⁷ P.L. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56, February 8, 1996.

⁸ H.R. Report 104-458. 104th Cong. 2d Sess., 207-209.

⁹ The declaration is reinforced by Section 601(c) of the TCA, stating that "the amendments made by this Act shall not be construed to modify, impair, or supersede Federal, State or local law unless expressly so provided . . ."

placement, construction or modification of [commercial mobile service] facilities shall be terminated.¹⁰

Note 1 to Section 1.1206(a) acknowledges this limited role of the FCC in resolving disputes arising under Section 332(c)(7). The first clause is directed generally at petitions seeking preemption of state or local regulatory authority. The second clause refers to petitions for relief under Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v). The only petitions for relief that can be entertained by the FCC under (B)(v) are those alleging local or state governmental actions “inconsistent with clause (iv).” Clause (iv) concerns the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions and is not at issue in the CTIA petition.

The petition seeks relief under (B)(i) and (B)(ii), but Congress has left such requests solely to the courts. This exclusive assignment of responsibility is recognized on the Commission’s Web site:

Allegations that a state or local government has acted inconsistently with Section 332(c)(7) are to be resolved exclusively by the courts (with the exception of cases involving regulation based on the health effects of RF emissions, which can be resolved by the courts or the Commission). Thus, other than RF emissions cases, the Commission's role in Section 332(c)(7) issues is primarily one of information and facilitation.¹¹

The purpose of a declaratory ruling is to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty.¹² CTIA’s manifest purpose is to terminate controversies in which its members are adverse to local

¹⁰ H.R. Report No. 104-458, at 208. As noted below, the exception for subparagraph (7)(B)(iv) precludes local or state regulation of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions from a personal wireless service antenna so long as the facility meets preemptive federal safeguards against such emissions.

¹¹ <http://wireless.fcc.gov/siting/local-state-gov.html>

¹² Section 1.2 of the Rules, citing Section 5(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 554(d).

or state governments. Removal of uncertainty is not an independent ground of the request, but is subordinate to terminating controversies by settling real disputes.

Nor is the petition circumscribed by its focus on Sections (B)(i), (ii) and (v). The vast majority of cases decided thus far in the courts have delved broadly into the meaning of unreasonable discrimination and prohibition under (B)(i)(I) and (II) and the application of (B)(iii), with its requirements of substantial evidence and decisions in writing based on a written record. Were the Commission to take up CTIA's invitation to interpret some subparagraphs of the statute, the agency could not avoid construing the rest of paragraph (c)(7) if asked to do so. Essentially, the FCC would violate the congressional instruction that the courts take an exclusive part in settling disputes. The Commission would take on the role of a "national zoning board," a role that it has long refused to play.¹³

A. CTIA Has Failed to Show that Processing Times Exceeding CTIA's Proposed Standards are Unreasonable.

It is no answer to say, as CTIA claims in its Opposition to motions for extension of time (note 3, *supra*), that it seeks only clarification to remove uncertainty, and not preemption to terminate controversy, over reasonable periods of time to reach local zoning decisions. Any clarification by the Commission setting shorter deadlines for zoning actions than those in local ordinances would amount to across-the-board preemptive resolution of disputes that Congress assigned exclusively to the courts. It is manifestly unfair to ask the Commission to determine the reasonableness of periods for zoning actions: zoning laws vary from state to state and the Commission has no experience or expertise in these processes.

¹³ *Preemption of Local Zoning and Other Regulation of Receive-Only Satellite Earth Stations*, 51 Fed. Reg. 5519 (Feb. 14, 1986) at ¶¶ 23, 27 and 39.

Moreover, the structure of Section 332(7)(B)(ii) does not lend itself to the pat 45-day and 75-day deadlines CTIA proposes. The plain language of the statute provides that the “reasonable period of time” for local action may take into account “the nature and scope” of the wireless service provider’s request. Thus, the reasonableness of a time for action depends on the volume, complexity and other features of the application (including its initial completeness), and these variables cannot always be fairly accommodated within the fixed intervals requested in the petition.¹⁴ Even applications to co-locate on existing facilities can vary in ways that might extend the time of review.¹⁵ Thus, for example, a community that normally processes applications within twenty days might reasonably find that the nature and scope of a particular request required more than 45 (or 75) days. Adopting CTIA’s deadlines for action would, in effect, rewrite Section 332(c)(7)(B)(ii) because Congress, by using the term “reasonable period,” recognized that in zoning reviews, different periods of time may be reasonable based on the facts and circumstances of each case.¹⁶

¹⁴ EIA/TIA Standard 222(G), “Structural Standards for Steel Antenna Towers and Antenna Supporting Structures,” frequently cited in municipal ordinances, discusses variables such as wind, icing, earthquakes and sheer added weight that can complicate co-locations as well as new construction.

¹⁵ For example, in its recently adopted ordinance, at Section 232(j), the City of Virginia Beach, VA makes co-locations permitted rather than “conditional” uses unless the tower is extended in height or the number of antennas exceeds the approved capacity of the tower. E-mail to Rick Ellrod from Deputy City Attorney Bill Macali, September 5, 2008. Similarly, the City of Wadsworth, Ohio places on a “fast track” – waiving notifications and public hearings – co-location applications in commercial and industrial districts that do not add more than 20 feet to the height of the existing tower. E-mail to Rick Ellrod from Jeff Kaiser of the City of Wadsworth, September 5, 2008. Of course, the time required to review a request for co-location may also depend on the nature of the structures that are associated with the additions to the towers.

¹⁶ The chart at Exhibit II from Arlington County, Virginia, covering 37 zoning actions August 2007-August 2008, shows but a single application that required more than 75 days to decide. Given the average processing time of 18 days for the 36 other applications, the County

Nor can a mere recitation of actual times elapsed, even if they were to be substantiated, prove that local communities are at fault. Examples of several proceedings that have been protracted by the carrier-applicants themselves are found at Exhibit I. And already present on this record are reminders from others that the length of a zoning review can be extended by federal requirements, such as those of the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) or the Advisory Commission on Historic Preservation. Important state environmental rules designed to protect sensitive coastal and other areas, and other state requirements, may also come into play. These requirements, which are not under the control of local governments, can add to the time required to review an application, but have nothing to do with CTIA’s allegations of municipal delays.

One of the Coalition members, Los Angeles County, notes that under the CTIA proposal, neither the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) nor the Permit Streamlining Act could operate with the intended neutrality toward applications of different types. Under CTIA’s approach, wireless facilities would be placed in front of all other land use decisions regardless of the relative dimension or impact of such projects. Under the CTIA “shot clock,” wireless applications would not be given the appropriate level of review and, in many cases, required CEQA review could not be completed. Congress did not intend to effectively eliminate any meaningful zoning and land use review to favor one given form of technology, wireless communications.¹⁷

Frequently local zoning applications must be published in newspapers of record, and abutting landowners or other neighbors to a site must be notified. In that event, some time

would hardly deserve a penalty of “deemed granted” at 75 days for the one application that took 80 days to decide.

¹⁷ Additional discussion of CEQA and the California state permitting law may be found at Exhibit V hereto.

allowances must be made for citizen response. In addition, there is ample testimony here about instances when lengthened review can produce better results than would a prescribed rush to judgment.¹⁸

Congress emphasized that it did not expect “preferential treatment” for wireless siting applications:

If a request for placement of a personal wireless service facility involves a zoning variance or a public hearing or comment process, the time period for rendering a decision will be the usual period under such circumstances. It is not the intent of this provision to give preferential treatment to the personal wireless service industry in the processing of requests or to subject their requests to any but the generally applicable time frames for zoning decision.¹⁹

Even if the Commission were empowered to settle disputes over delays in zoning decisions – which is not the case – the FCC could not require that the most complex actions must be resolved in no more than 30 days from the deadline for action on simpler applications without creating exactly the sort of “generally applicable time frame” that Congress precluded.

Instead, Congress chose to match the flexibility in (B)(ii) with a parallel latitude in (B)(v). At any time the wireless provider comes to believe that delay in action on its application constitutes a “failure to act,” it need only mark that point – presumably by written warning to the

¹⁸ See, e.g., Letter of Mayor Steven M. Berman, Mayor of Gilbert, AZ, September 15, 2008 (“A one-size-fits-all approach will undermine the positive outcomes that can be achieved through zoning processes administered at the local level.”). See also Comments of the Cable and Telecommunications Committee of the New Orleans City Council, 12 (“The proposed ‘shot clock’ rules are backwards . . . if the applicant holds the ball too long, then the applicant may be rewarded with automatic site approval.”)

¹⁹ Report No. 104-458, at 208. At the same page, the conferees allowed for local flexibility “to treat facilities that create different visual, aesthetic or safety concerns differently to the extent permitted under generally applicable zoning requirements even if those facilities provide functionally equivalent services.”

zoning authority – and file for judicial relief within 30 days. The wireless provider does not face, as CTIA claims (Petition, 13), a “Hobson’s choice” without viable alternatives.

As will be shown below, the courts have offered ample guidance on both “reasonable period” under (B)(ii) and “failure to act” under (B)(v). In most cases, the local zoning authority will also have created a record through its pace of action on applications of varying degrees of complexity in its community. That record becomes a set of benchmarks the wireless provider can use to measure its own treatment. There is little chance that the 30-day clock for appeal in (B)(v) will run out on the wireless provider because the statute, in effect, allows it to start the clock when it chooses.²⁰

B. The Exclusive Jurisdiction of the Courts Extends to Disputes Arising Under the “Prohibition of Service” Clause.

CTIA asks the Commission to declare that Section 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(II) “preserves a carrier’s right to make reasonable deployments, even if the area in question is already served by another provider.” (Petition, 31) The Commission is no more empowered to resolve this dispute over the meaning of (B)(i) than to settle controversies arising from (B)(ii) and (v). Rather, the issue has been left to the courts. As CTIA acknowledges, there is yet no final judicial answer. However, the disagreement among U.S. Courts of Appeal does not mean that the FCC may step in to resolve the issue; it is simply the normal consequence when Congress chooses to rely upon

²⁰ However, a disappointed applicant cannot have it both ways by appealing a denial as an unreasonable delay. *New York SMSA Ltd. Partnership v. Town of Clarkstown*, 99 F.Supp.2d 381, 395 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (“By waiting until after the final decision was rendered, Plaintiffs forewent a claim of ‘unreasonable delay’.”)

judicial remedies. Ultimately, any significant disputes can be resolved through a petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court.²¹

In any event, the judicial differences over the “one-provider” rule are distinctly secondary to the courts’ agreement that prohibitions of service can only be measured in terms of “significant gaps” in service or by the absence of feasible alternatives. For example, relatively confined “dead spots” do not qualify as significant.²² The courts agree that the mere fact that a community denies a permit for a provider’s first or cheapest site choice does not amount to a prohibition; courts have required some showing that alternatives are not available. And the provider’s search for alternative sites must be thorough.²³

Thus, for CTIA to say (Petition, 30) that any “given area,” no matter its size, must be declared open to multiple wireless service providers conflicts with the courts’ agreement that the concept of prohibition must have some boundaries. These judicial interpretations have rarely, if ever, arisen in the context of bans on service in entire “markets.” Thus, CTIA’s interchangeable use of “area” and “market” (Petition, 30-35) inflates the alleged problem beyond all recognition.

III. THE FCC IS NOT FREE TO INTERPRET A STATUTE TO RESOLVE DISPUTES WHERE CONGRESS HAS REFUSED IT THAT AUTHORITY.

The CTIA petition is not helped by its reference (21-22) to the recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit upholding the Commission’s authority to interpret Section

²¹ Sup. Ct. R. 10(a).

²² *Second Generation Props., LP v. Town of Pelham*, 313 F.3d 620, 631 (1st Cir. 2002); *Voicestream PCS I, LLC v. City of Hillsboro*, 301 F. Supp. 2d 1251, 1261 (D. Or. 2004).

²³ *USCOC of Greater Iowa, Inc. v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of the City of Des Moines*, 465 F.3d 817, 825 (8th Cir. 2006). See also *Voicestream Minneapolis, Inc. v. St. Croix County*, 342 F.3d 818, 835 (7th Cir. 2003).

621(a) of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §541(a).²⁴ There, it might have been argued that Congress was silent on what might constitute an “unreasonable refusal to award” a competitive cable TV franchise. Here, however, Congress was never silent on interpreting subsections 332(c)(7)(B)(i)-(iii) and (v). In no uncertain terms, the national legislature said that the courts, not the FCC, were to have exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes arising under Section 332(c)(7)(B) – with the single specified exception of (B)(iv), where jurisdiction could be shared with the FCC.

Whatever the degree of freedom allowed the Commission to interpret the Communications Act as a general matter, it cannot extend to sections specifically ruled off-limits by Congress.²⁵ Because the CTIA petition is fundamentally a request that the FCC resolve disputes arising under (B)(i) and (ii) and (B)(v), it must be dismissed or denied because the agency lacks the authority to hear the case.

IV. EVEN IF THE COMMISSION COULD ENTERTAIN THE PETITION AS TO SECTION 332(C)(7), THE ALLEGATIONS PRESENTED DO NOT COMPEL FCC ACTION.

At page 10, the petition recites a remarkable history of growth in personal wireless services since the adoption of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 – subscribership up nearly 700%, penetration increasing from 13 to 84% of the U.S. population. The number of cell sites has expanded by tenfold. (Petition, 10) According to CTIA, the same story is beginning to be written in so-called wireless broadband services. It is difficult to divine from these statistics any

²⁴ *Alliance for Community Media v. FCC*, 529 F.3d 763 (6th Cir. 2008).

²⁵ *La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. FCC*, 476 U.S. 355, 374-375 (1986) (“An agency may not confer power upon itself. To permit an agency to expand its power in the face of a congressional limitation on its jurisdiction would be to grant to the agency power to override Congress. This we are both unwilling and unable to do”).

obstruction of personal wireless service by local zoning authorities. CTIA's own success story conflicts with its claim of widespread obstruction. This is why some of the parties seeking more time to comment (*see* n.28) have asked CTIA (under FCC order if necessary) to identify the zoning authorities its petition accuses of obstruction and delay.

CTIA claims to be concerned for three reasons: (1) growth has been uneven across the country; (2) rigorous build-out requirements for broadband deployment put an additional premium on speed of local approvals; and (3) public safety services, including enhanced 9-1-1 access, increasingly depend on the density and capacity of antenna placements. (Petition, 10-13)

We focus below on the first of these points, because the last two can be disposed of at once. The claim at (2) that local zoning authorities cannot match their schedules to the 5-year and 10-year build-out requirements of wireless broadband licensees is sheer speculation at this stage, and the record of narrowband cellular deployment is to the contrary. The claim at (3) provides no evidence of public safety hardship arising from zoning delays. Indeed, it is counter-intuitive that local governments would jeopardize their own public safety systems and services by failing to act on essential wireless applications.

A. There Is No Credible Support for CTIA's Claim of "Egregious Delays."²⁶

The petition's assertion of uneven growth in personal wireless services attributable to unreasonable behavior by local zoning officials remains almost entirely undocumented. CTIA has not supplied the "compiled data on siting from multiple members" to which the petition refers at page 15 and elsewhere. Of the "more than 3,300 wireless siting applications pending

²⁶ Petition, 14. In contrast, Exhibit III hereto provides in question-and-answer form information on the experience of one Coalition member, the City of Portland, with wireless tower siting and antenna placement. The exhibit reflects, at minimum, a conscientious effort to avoid delays in application processing.

before local jurisdictions,” we know nothing. We do not know how this information was gathered or how the details were verified, how many jurisdictions are included, how long applications have been pending, how many are relatively simple co-locations and how many are more complex, or how vigorously the applications have been prosecuted or how often amended.²⁷

Local government representatives seeking more time to respond in this proceeding than the 30 and 15 days initially allotted for comment and reply have observed that the instances cited at 14-15 and 25-27 of the petition are unidentified. This deprives the local governments involved of a fair opportunity to rebut CTIA’s claims (arguably a violation of due process), and deprives the Commission of an opportunity to have CTIA’s unsupported claims critically examined. Without specific details from CTIA, neither the accused local governments nor any other potential commenters – nor the Commission – are able to evaluate CTIA’s claims of delay or refusal to act.²⁸

B. There Is No Indication that the Courts to Which Congress Assigned Dispute Resolution Under Section 332(C)(7)(B) Have Been Unfair or Derelict in Their Duties.

The remarkable fact about the judicial record on these wireless siting cases is how few of them involve unreasonable delay pursuant to (B)(ii).²⁹ After a handful of decisions in the early

²⁷ Indeed, the CTIA petition contains no declarations to support any of the facts alleged, other than a one-sentence *pro forma* statement by a CTIA attorney.

²⁸ Motion of Montgomery County, Maryland, August 22, 2008; Motion of National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, August 25, 2008. Not even in its ex parte visits with Commissioners’ Offices has CTIA deigned to identify the local authorities it accuses. *See, e.g.*, Presentation to Renee Crittendon, September 5, 2008, slide 5 of 5.

²⁹ At Exhibit IV hereto is an annotated list of federal court orders where at least one of the issues alleged was local zoning delay. On average, that is just one decision per year since 1996.

years (1996-99) on the question of “moratoria,”³⁰ the focus of such challenges shifted to prohibition of service, unreasonable discrimination pursuant to (B)(i), and absence of substantial evidence under (B)(iii).

In the *Masterpage* case cited by the petition (n. 70, 28-29), the ruling court was appalled by a greater than two-year delay in accepting the wireless siting application – owing to an over-extended moratorium – and a further two years in which the lack of a decision prompted Masterpage to seek judicial relief. Such cases are precisely the reason for Congress’ inclusion of subparagraph (B)(v) as a remedy for “failure to act.” However, this one example, or even a few, does not suggest a need for Commission intervention against the intent of Congress. The list of cases decided under (B)(i) is lengthy, but the petition provides no indication that the courts are overwhelmed or unable to decide cases promptly.³¹

V. LOCAL ZONING VARIANCES ARE NOT, PER SE, PROHIBITIONS UNDER SECTION 253.

A. Section 253 Does Not Apply to Local Authority Over Wireless Facility Siting.

Congress intended that only Section 332, and not Section 253, would affect local government authority over tower siting. Section 332(c)(7) makes this clear: “Except as provided in this paragraph, nothing in this chapter shall limit or affect the authority of a . . . local

³⁰ See, e.g., *Sprint Spectrum v. City of Medina*, 924 F.Supp.1036 (W.D.Wash. 1996). See also information about the earlier CTIA petition at <http://wireless.fcc.gov/siting/local-state-gov.html> and <http://www.fcc.gov/statelocal/agreement.html>.

³¹ A rough indicator may be found in the annotations for Section 332 in the United States Code Annotated. Even there, however, the decisions involving Paragraph (c)(7) are not compiled under “prohibition of service,” as such, but under other key headings such as “unreasonable discrimination” and “alternative sites.” (Thomson/WestGroup, 2001, cumulative annual pocket part 2008.

government . . . over decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless facilities.” 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7).³²

This language makes Section 332 the sole provision of the Act affecting local authority over zoning, and expressly prohibits the application of other provisions of the Chapter, which includes Section 253. CTIA tries to distinguish between zoning decisions and zoning ordinances, and seems to claim that only the latter are subject to Section 253. Petition at 35. That argument makes no sense textually: the plain language of Section 332(c)(7) protects not just decisions, but anything that could “limit or affect” the “authority” to make decisions. The authority to make decisions derives from ordinances and regulations (and state statutes). To preempt such requirements, as CTIA asks the Commission to do under Section 253, is to directly “limit or affect” local authority to make decisions. As a result, the FCC may not interpret or apply Section 253(a) to zoning in this proceeding, or any other.³³

³² When it wanted to carve out Section 253 from such a preservation clause, Congress demonstrated that it knew how to do so. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(3) (“Notwithstanding paragraph (2), but subject to section 253, nothing in this section shall prohibit . . .”); 47 U.S.C. § 252(f)(2) (“Except as provided in section 253, nothing in this section shall prohibit . . .”). The fact that Section 253 itself contains an exemption for Section 332(c)(3) does not imply that Section 253 does apply to Section 332(c)(7). Section 332(c)(3) was adopted prior to Section 253, and Congress simply chose to include the exemption as part of the addition of Section 253, rather than as an amendment to Section 332(c)(3). Because Section 332(c)(7) contains its own language that makes *all* provisions of Title II of the Act inapplicable, a comparable exemption in Section 253 was unnecessary and would not have accomplished Congressional goals, as Congress meant for the preservation clause to protect broadly against application of Section 253 and other provisions of the Act to zoning authority.

³³ The statute-at-large uses the terminology “nothing in this Act,” a reference to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. 110 Stat. 56, 151 (1996). Of course, both Section 253 and Section 332 are sections of that Act.

CTIA's reliance on *Sprint Telephony PCS, L.P. v. County of San Diego*, 490 F.3d 700, 713 (9th Cir. 2007),³⁴ as contrary authority was misleading at best. By the time the CTIA petition had been filed, the Ninth Circuit had already issued an order stating that it would rehear the case *en banc* and prohibiting citation of the decision cited by CTIA "to any court of the Ninth Circuit." *Sprint Telephony PCS, L.P. v. County of San Diego*, 527 F.3d 791 (9th Cir. 2008). Of course, the effect of that order was to render the initial decision a legal nullity, and to give the appeal to the *en banc* panel. The *en banc* decision issued by the Ninth Circuit found it unnecessary to decide whether Section 253 applied to zoning challenges, because it found the Sprint challenge failed under either standard. The *en banc* decision, in other words, came to conclusions that are the opposite of those reached in the decision cited by CTIA. *Sprint Tel. PCS v. County of San Diego*, 2008 WL 4166657 (9th Cir. 2008).³⁵

B. Even If Section 253 Were Applicable, the FCC May Not Declare That All Local Zoning Variances that Automatically Require a Carrier to Seek a Variance Run Afoul of Section 253.

Even if Section 253 could be read to affect local zoning decisions regarding the placement of personal wireless facilities (which, as shown, it may not), Section 253 cannot be

³⁴ *T-Mobile USA v. City of Anacortes*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37481, *8-9 (W.D. Wash. 2008), cited by CTIA at n.89, simply relied on the earlier three-judge panel decision in *Sprint Telephony*, and thus provides no additional support for the CTIA position.

³⁵ Congress provided further evidence that Section 253 should not apply to tower siting disputes in Section 253(d), which contemplates preemption by the FCC. In contrast, Section 332(c)(7) plainly contemplates that, aside from RF emissions issues, any preemption would arise exclusively via judicial action.

applied to bar all local ordinances that would require a carrier to seek a variance, as CTIA requests.³⁶

1. The Plain Language of Section 253(a) Requires a Challenger to Demonstrate that a Local Requirement Prohibits, or Has the Effect of Prohibiting, its Ability to Provide Service.

CTIA's argument is rooted in a misreading of the plain language of Section 253(a). CTIA relies exclusively on decisions that can be traced back to that Circuit's decision in *City of Auburn v. Qwest Corporation*, 260 F.3d 1160 (9th Cir. 2001). See Petition at nn.88, 89, 91, 92, 94. However, on September 11, 2008, an *en banc* panel for the Ninth Circuit overturned *Auburn* and its progeny, concluding that those decisions were based on an erroneous reading of the plain language of Section 253. *Sprint*, 2008 WL 4166657, at *6. In *Sprint*, the Ninth Circuit noted that *Auburn* had previously interpreted Section 253(a) to bar any local regulation that "may" (*i.e.*, "might") prohibit the ability to provide a service. *Id.* at *4. If that were a correct interpretation, the court explained, Section 253(a) would preempt any local regulation that placed a burden on a provider, whether the burden arose to the level of a prohibition or not, and it would also preempt local laws that leave a locality discretion to bar provision of services under certain circumstances, even if the local laws had been applied in a manner completely consistent with Section 253. *Id.* (quoting *Auburn*, 260 F.3d at 1176). Indeed, the mere existence of discretion had been read by some courts to violate the test in *Auburn*.

It is this *Auburn* test on which the CTIA petition relies. As we show below, CTIA does not show any instance or any particular ordinance that actually or effectively prohibits entry, nor

³⁶ CTIA's is an odd request, since an ordinance that allows for a variance, by definition, creates a circumstance under which there is no "prohibition" (and therefore, no violation of the federal statute). CTIA's argument might have been more plausible had it been aimed at ordinances that *forbid* variances, not at those that require (and allow for) them.

does it suggest anything more than that the variance process involves costs (which, of course, was obvious to Congress when it endorsed the local zoning process).

As the Ninth Circuit pointed out, however, the *Auburn* test on which CTIA relies cannot be squared with a proper reading of the plain language of Section 253(a). A plaintiff “must establish either an outright prohibition or an effective prohibition on the provision of telecommunications services; a plaintiff’s showing that a locality could *potentially* prohibit the provision of telecommunications services is insufficient.” *Id.* at *6 (9th Cir. 2008) (emphasis in original). In so holding, *Sprint* followed the Eighth Circuit’s decision adopted last year in *Level 3 Communications v. City of St. Louis*, 477 F.3d 528, 533 (8th Cir. 2007).

The FCC has long adopted the proper reading of Section 253’s plain language, as the Ninth Circuit noted. *Sprint*, 2008 WL 4166657 at *5. In a 1997 decision, the FCC explicitly rejected an argument that Section 253 preempts on a *per se* basis, and correctly ruled that the statute requires a factual showing:

We cannot agree that the City's exercise of its contracting authority as a location provider constitutes, *per se*, a situation proscribed by section 253(a). The City's contracting conduct would implicate section 253(a) only if it materially inhibited or limited the ability of any competitor or potential competitor to compete in a fair and balanced legal and regulatory environment in the market for payphone services in the Central Business District. In other words, the City's contracting conduct would have to *actually prohibit or effectively prohibit* the ability of a payphone service provider to provide service outdoors on the public rights-of-way in the Central Business District. As described above, the present record does not permit us to conclude that the City's contracting conduct has caused such results. If we are presented in the future with additional record evidence indicating that the City may be exercising its contracting authority in a manner that arguably “prohibits or has the effect of prohibiting” the ability of payphone service providers other than Pacific Bell to install payphones outdoors on the public rights-of-way in the Central Business District, we will revisit the issue at that time.

In re Cal. Payphone Ass'n, 12 F.C.C.R. 14191, 14209 at ¶ 38 (emphasis added). The Commission later reinforced the point:

With respect to a particular ordinance or other legal requirement, it is up to those seeking preemption to demonstrate to the Commission that the challenged ordinance or legal requirement prohibits or has the effect of prohibiting potential providers ability to provide an interstate or intrastate telecommunications service under section 253(a). Parties seeking preemption of a local legal requirement such as the Troy Telecommunications Ordinance must supply us with *credible and probative evidence* that the challenged requirement falls within the proscription of section 253(a) without meeting the requirements of section 253(b) and/or (c).

In the Matter of TCI Cablevision of Oakland County, Inc., Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 97-331, 12 F.C.C.R. 21,396 (September 19, 1997). The Commission instructed that petitioners making challenges under Section 253 should describe, among other things: “specific telecommunications service or services [that] petitioner [is] prohibited or effectively prohibited from providing,” “what group or groups of actual or potential customers are being denied access to the service or services,” and “what are the factual circumstances that cause the petitioner to be denied the ability to offer the relevant telecommunications service or services.” *Suggested Guidelines for Petitions for Ruling Under Section 253 of the Communications Act*, FCC 98-295, 13 F.C.C.R. 22970, 22,971-72 (November 17, 1998).³⁷

2. CTIA Fails to Show that the Requirements in Question “Prohibit or Have the Effect of Prohibiting” a Carrier’s Ability to Provide Service.

CTIA’s petition falls far short of demonstrating that ordinances requiring a variance “prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting” a carrier’s ability to provide service. The petition

³⁷ A rule preempting ordinances that require variances on a *per se* basis would be plainly inconsistent with Congress’s intent. H.R. Conf. Rep. 104-458, 208 (1996) (“If a request for placement of a personal wireless service facility involves a zoning variance or a public hearing or comment process, the time period for rendering a decision will be the usual period under such circumstances”).

does not challenge any particular community's requirement *as applied* to a particular provider. Instead, the petition challenges *all* ordinances that require a variance *on their face*. Petition at 36 (“The FCC should declare that any ordinance that automatically requires a wireless carrier to seek a variance, regardless of the type and location of the proposal, is preempted”). As the Supreme Court has explained, “A facial challenge to a legislative Act is . . . the most difficult challenge to mount successfully, since the challenger must establish that no set of circumstances exists under which the Act would be valid.” *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 745 (1987); *Sprint*, 2008 WL 4166657 at *7.

CTIA's petition falls woefully short of meeting this burden. CTIA argues, without citation, that “[a]pplicants seeking variance of zoning ordinances *generally* face a much more onerous application process as well as mandatory public hearings.” Petition 36 (emphasis added). CTIA speculates, without any evidence or citation, that the height requirement of an unnamed New Hampshire community “could” effectively preclude a provider from serving an entire community. *Id.* It points out that an unnamed Vermont community's setback requirement “effectively requires a variance,” but then CTIA fails to offer any evidence whatsoever about the “effect” of such a requirement.

In sum, CTIA never even attempts to show, as it must, that variance processes *always* impose a demonstrated “prohibitory” burden. As the Ninth Circuit explained in rejecting a similar argument:

Although a zoning board could conceivably use these procedural requirements to stall applications and thus effectively prohibit the provision of wireless services, the zoning board equally could use these tools to evaluate fully and promptly the merits of an application. Sprint has pointed to no requirement that, on its face, demonstrates that Sprint is effectively prohibited from providing services.

Sprint, 2008 WL 4166657 *7. Even if an applicant that was “prohibited” or “effectively prohibited” by a particular highly onerous variance process could bring a challenge under Section 253(a), Congress certainly did not intend to ban all ordinances simply because they require a variance process. *Cf.* H.R. Conf. Rep. 104-458, 208 (stressing that “decisions be made on a case-by-case basis” under the “prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting” language in Section 332); *Sprint*, 2008 WL 4166657 at *6 (Congress did not intend “prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting” to have different meanings under Section 253 and Section 332).

3. The Relief Requested Cannot Be Squared With Section 253(d).

As importantly, the CTIA petition ignores the fact that the statute, in Section 253(d), defines precisely how and under what circumstances the Commission may entertain a “prohibition” challenge under Section 253(a). Section 253(d) envisions a case-by-case, tailored determination: the Commission must provide “notice and an opportunity for public comment” and then may only preempt “such statute, regulation, or legal requirement to the extent necessary to correct such violation or inconsistency.” 47 U.S.C. § 253(d). As CTIA has not identified *any* particular ordinance, or even the communities that allegedly adopted invalid statutes or regulations, it is hard to imagine how these requisites could be satisfied. Without particular facts the Commission is certainly not in a position to preempt only “to the extent necessary,” as the statute requires, to prevent a prohibition (particularly since there is no prohibition shown).

Moreover, the Petition assumes that the ordinances and regulations being challenged – whatever they may be – are not protected from preemption by either Section 253(b) or (c). It is quite obvious that land use authority involves the exercise of police powers to protect public safety and welfare, so Section 253(b) is clearly implicated by the request. But the Commission

cannot determine whether the protections apply outside of a specific challenge in a specific context.

Moreover, many localities are now dealing with the special problems created by placement of wireless facilities in the rights-of-way (including the effect of placement of the antennas and associated equipment on the footprint of poles, traffic safety, line of sight, ADA requirements and the like). The rule advanced by the Petition would broadly preempt any ordinance of the type it describes, even if the ordinance directly related to matters that fall within the ambit of Section 253(c), and therefore stood outside the jurisdiction of the FCC.

In sum, even assuming that Section 253 applied to tower siting (which it does not), the petition is based on a misreading of the substantive requirements of Section 253(a), and requires the Commission to ignore the provisions of Sections 253(b), (c) and (d). Taken together, this is reason enough to reject the Petition.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the Coalition for Local Zoning Authority asks that the Commission dismiss or deny the Petition for Declaratory Ruling of CTIA.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES, AND COUNTY OF SAN
DIEGO, CA; TOWN OF PALM BEACH,
FL; CITY OF ATLANTA, GA; CITY OF
DUBUQUE, IA; ANNE ARUNDEL
COUNTY AND MONTGOMERY
COUNTY, MD; TOWN OF
SOUTHAMPTON AND CITY OF WHITE
PLAINS, NY; CITY OF PORTLAND, OR;
HENRICO COUNTY AND CITY OF
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA

By Frederick E. Ellrod III

Frederick E. Ellrod III
James R. Hobson
Matthew K. Schettenhelm
Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C.
1155 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036-4320
(202) 785-0600

September 29, 2008

ITS ATTORNEYS

6808\01\00142319.DOC

EXHIBIT I

The Wireless Applicant as a Source of Delay

Palm Beach, FL

E-mail from Tom Bradford, Deputy Town Manager, to Rick Ellrod:

Just about every case involves delays caused by the applicant. Most applications are handled by third party contractors for the service provider. Also, typically, the project manager has so many applications on their plate that they have a hard time remembering from one application to the next. Often the project manager is not even familiar with basic terminology used in the development review process. The last problematic trend I have seen is the high rate of turnover in project managers hired by third party contractors.

Montgomery County, MD

Excerpt of letter from Marjorie Williams, Chair, Transmission Facilities Coordinating Group ("TFCG"), to Rick Ellrod, September 10, 2008:

The telecommunications providers submit applications that are incomplete and have many errors. In the site acquisition field, there is very high turnover of employees. There have been as many as 4 or 5 different representatives representing an application and submitting conflicting information.

Town of Hudson, MA

E-mail from Andrew Massa, a Town resident whose property abuts a site at issue, to Rick Ellrod and Jim Hobson, September 11, 2008:

1. Hudson, Mass. Zoning-by-laws define a wireless overlay district, which equals towns water tank sites (high ground). Some of said sites are directly within single family dwelling zones.
2. Current permit request in front of ZBA by OmniPoint is to build towers at two water tank sites.
 1. Site A has an existing tower with vacant space on it. Omni demands a second tower.
 2. Site B has no towers, Omni demands an exclusion to specific fall zone by law down from a 200' diameter fall zone to a 150' diameter fall zone.
3. Prior 6 month process of site plan approval thru Town Planning Board.
 1. Continual extension requests by Omni.
 2. No answers by Omni
 3. Different attorney each meeting by Omni
4. Current ZBA process.
 1. First meeting set for mid August by Omni (Prime vacation time)
 2. Omni did not have approved site plans available.
 3. Omni had few answers/information for board.
 4. Omni has requested extension after first meeting - next meeting in Oct.

City of Greensboro, NC

E-mail of Steve Galanti, Senior Planner, City of Greensboro, to James Hobson, September 11, 2008:

The last time we had a request to build a new tower was October of 2006. It took the Technical Review Committee 78 days from the first submission to approval. The total TRC review time was 27 days while it took the applicant 51 days to revise the plans to meet our ordinance. The reason for the delay was the applicant not revising the plan to meet our ordinance in a timely fashion.

Since then all the applications have been collocations. A permit to collocate without expanding the compound takes between 7 and 14 days. A permit to collocate with a compound expansion takes between 18 and 21 days.

We only have one pending application for a collocation on a Duke Power tower on Jessup grove Road. It was first submitted July 18, 2008. It appears from the review comments that compliance with the state mandated watershed regulations and building code are the main factors in the delay. The plan review was complete on August 1, 2008 and the applicant has not resubmitted the application with the revisions.

Thanks,

Steven W. Galanti, AICP
Senior Planner

Telecommunications Facilities

From 8/1/07 to 9/1/08

R No	SP No .	Site Plan Name	Bldg Name or Address	Filing Date	Code 1	ZA ActionDate	ZA Action	Days Difference
2559	NA	VA2194B Andenvil	2305 S Walter Reed Dr	8/22/2007	1300	8/27/2007	Approve	5
2620	87	Ballston-Sprint/Nextel	3800 N Fairfax Dr	10/15/2007	1300	11/19/2007	Approve	35
2621	NA	Addison - Sprint/Nextel	815 s 18th St	10/15/2007	1300	11/19/2007	Approve	35
2638	NA	South Arlington Sprint/Nextel	1830 Columbia Pike	10/29/2007	1300	10/30/2007	Approve	1
2643	61	Verizon Wireless	200 n Glebe Rd	11/5/2007	1300	11/7/2007	Approve	2
2649	121	Crystal City Hyatt/Sprint	2799 JD Highway	11/7/2007	1300	11/19/2007	Approve	12
2670	49	WAC332D-Bank of America	3401 Columbia Pike	11/30/2007	1300	12/12/2007	Approve w/ conditions	12
2680	NA	Parkglenn Communications Facility	5100 8th Rd	12/6/2007	1300	12/13/2007	Approve	7
2690	NA	Arlington Ridge Communications facility	1200 S Arlington Riske Rd	12/12/2007	1300	12/18/2007	Approve	6
2724	87	Fiber Tower - WDC0445	3800 N Fairfax Dr	1/25/2008	1300	2/4/2008	Approve	10
2736	NA	T-Mobile Northeast LLC Site WAC 126D	100 N Wayne St	2/5/2008	1300	4/8/2008	Approve	63
2749	2823	T-Mobile Northeast LLC WAC005A	2400 N Wakefield St	2/25/2008	1300	2/29/2008	Deny	4
2751	2244	TARA - Verizon Wireless	5301 N 22nd St	2/26/2008	1300	3/12/2008	Approve	15
2763	44	VA0913 Westmont-Sprint.Nextel	3401 Columbia Pike	3/7/2008	1300	3/18/2008	Approve w/ condition	11
2764	72	VA0782 Bon Air Sprint.Nextel	4300 N Carlin Spring Rd	3/7/2008	1300	3/31/2008	Approve	24
2781	NA	Wakefield School - Sprint	4901 S Chesterfield Rd	3/24/2008	1300	6/12/2008	Approve	80
2814	135	verizon wireless	1225 Jefferson Davis Highway	4/18/2008	1300	5/1/2008	Approve	13
2815	167	verizon wireless	2011 Crystal Dr	4/18/2008	1300	5/1/2008	Approve	13
2816	53	verizon wireless	1401 Lee Highway	4/18/2008	1300	5/1/2008	Approve	13
2817	NA	verizon wireless	2400 18th St S	4/18/2008	1300	5/7/2008	Approve	19
2818	NA	verizon wireless	3000 Spout RunParkway	4/18/2008	1300	5/7/2008	Approve	19
2825	231	verizon wireless	2200 Clarendon Blvd	4/25/2008	1300	5/5/2008	Approve	10
2829	NA	WAC342A "Horizons East"	4300 Old Dominion Dr	4/30/2008	1300	5/5/2008	Approve	5
2831	87	WDC0449	3800 N Fairfax Dr	4/30/2008	1300	5/7/2008	Approve	7
2835	1671	VA3798 ATT Marymount Univ	2807 N Glebe Rd	5/8/2008	1300	5/23/2008	Approve	15
2841	NA	Country Club Towers/T-Mobile	2400 S Glebe Rd	5/13/2008	1300	5/23/2008	Approve	10
2849	BY/NA	Cricket IAD-508	5301 22nd St N	5/16/2008	1300	6/13/2008	Approve w/ condition	28
2869	121	Crystal City Backhaul DC0148061	2799 Jefferson davis Hwy	6/2/2008	1300	8/8/2008	Approve	67

Telecommunications Facilities

From 8/1/07 to 9/1/08

2871	NA BR	at & t	5115 Little falls Road	5/30/2008	1300	6/27/2008	Approve	28
2876	333	at & t	1020 N Highland St	6/4/2008	1300	6/12/2008	Approve w/ condition	8
2895	2823	Sprint Antennas	2400 N Wakefield St	6/18/2008	1300	8/8/2008	Deny	51
2896	BR	Sprint Antennas	3945 Military Rd	6/18/2008	1300	7/9/2008	Approve	21
2915	NA	VA1857 Quinton Arms	4020 Washington Blvd	7/8/2008	1300	7/10/2008	Approve	2
2923	BR	Cricket	3845 N Military Rd	7/18/2008	1300	7/24/2008	Approve 3 antennas	6
2929	NA	Country Club Towers - T Mobile	2400 S Glebe Rd	7/23/2008	1300	7/25/2008	Approve	2
2930	111	Cricket	2480 S Glebe Rd	7/18/2008	1300	7/25/2008	Approve 3 antennas	7
2946	106	Verizon S Four Mile Run	2720 S Arlington Mill Dr	8/8/2008	1300	8/21/2008	Approve	13
2955	121	Cricket @2799 Jefferson Davis Highway	2799 JD Hwy	8/14/2008	1300			
2966	86	Cricket @ 900 Orme St	900 Orme St	8/26/2008	1300			
Ave								
Approval - 18.35 Days								
Total No of Requests - 37								

Wireless Siting Application Processing

City of Portland, Oregon

Sept 25, 2008

Land Use Review Applications (State Law requires all to be processed to Final Decision within 120 days of a completed application). Note that these have doubled since 2002-03.

2000-01	879
2001-02	935
2002-03	659
2003-04	829
2004-05	1,180 est
2005-06	1,372
2006-07	1,368
2007-08	1,400 est
2008-09	1,375 est

Land Use Review Percent of customers rating the overall quality of the land use review process as Very Good or Good (remarkable given doubling of LU reviews since 2002-03)

2005-06	68%
2006-07	79%
2007-08	83%
2008-09	83% est

Percent of customers very satisfied or satisfied with land use review timeliness (again, remarkable given doubling of LU reviews since 2002-03)

2005-06	66%
2006-07	79%
2007-08	80%
2008-09	82% est

Delays caused by tower applicants, either by failing to take local zoning into account in planning in the first place, or in the process itself;

As governed by state land use statutes, any wireless application that does trigger a zoning review will be processed in a maximum of 120-days once the application is

deemed complete. The majority of delays in processing the application come from two sources: first, the applicant submitted an incomplete application. Roughly 30-35% of wireless applications are submitted and determined to be incomplete, due to missing site plans, missing narrative addressing the relevant approval criteria, or missing the information demonstrating the proposal meets all of the applicable development standards.

The second source of delay is the applicant, generally at the recommendation of review staff, places the review on hold in order to work out concerns, alter the configuration of the facility, or to collaborate with neighbors to ensure that the visual impacts are minimized. These sorts of delays invariably result in a much improved proposal.

Please also note that wireless industry is rather notorious for not calling for a final inspection as required. Once a facility is up and running, they frequently fail to complete the permit process. So, a number of later year permits are still 'pending.' This means that a permit was issued, but inspections never requested, or there was a land use review that needs to be finalized, or the application is in but not complete. We would say that the vast number of 'pending' applications (especially ones older than one year), are still pending because no one called for a final inspection. The City's priorities are to focus on fire/life/safety inspections, such as final occupancy approval of multi-family housing. There is insufficient staffing to reach down into the work load for enforcement of final inspections of these types of permits. Many of these do not get discovered until another carrier comes in and applies to co-locate on an existing tower.

Zoning procedures and negotiations leading to changes in the applicant's original proposal and resulting in a mutually acceptable plan.

One example of beneficial delays to the applicant was during a Type III Conditional Use for a new monopole in a commercial zone directly across the street from a single dwelling residential neighborhood. With strong citizen input, the wireless provider realized that the proposed facility could be hosted by a replacement pole in the city's public right of way, thus significantly minimizing the visual intrusion of the facility near a residential zone. Because the antennae were hosted on a utility pole in the middle of a run of utility poles along that side of the street, there was no need for a new monopole and the antennas blended into the background of the existing utility poles.

Are requests to site towers handled through your normal zoning processes?

Yes, but many applications are allowed by right (without any discretionary review) if they are in an Industrial, Employment or Commercial zone, and meet the height limits of the base zone, and are more than 50 feet from a residential zone.

- Collocation is always allowed by right on towers.
- Collocation on rooftops is always allowed by right in Industrial, Employment, or Commercial zones as long as they are more than 50 feet from a residential zone.
- Collocation on rooftops will trigger a Type II administrative review if the facility is in an open space, design or historic district or in a residential zone.
- A new tower within height limits in an Industrial, Employment, or Commercial zone is allowed by right
- A new tower in Residential or Park (OS) zones is a Type III Conditional Use review and requires a public hearing
- Wireless facilities on roof tops or sides of buildings will trigger a Type II Design review in design districts
- New or collocating building mounts in or within 50 feet of a Residential zone will be administrative (Type II) decisions.

Do you have any special procedures that allow wireless applicants to avoid zoning procedures that would otherwise apply if they meet certain standards? What are those procedures?

Yes. 33.274.030 & .035 define what is exempt, allowed by right, and what triggers a review:

New towers in Industrial, Employment and Commercial areas are generally exempt from review.

Collocation on existing towers is exempt from review

Applications for siting on existing or taller replacement utility poles in the streets do not go through zoning review.

Applications for locating facilities within the right-of-way are rarely subject to zoning review at any level.

How many wireless site applications are now pending with you?

30.

If the oldest is more than 45 days (for collocations) or 75 days (other than collocations), please explain why it has not yet been resolved.

Primarily because the process of moving to a mutually acceptable different solution (see below) takes a little longer due to completing the record, staff review and submit a report, public notice and hearing, and providing adequate time for a Hearings Officer to consider the entire record and write a decision.

How long does it usually take to process an application?

- Co-location ("colo") on towers: permit in 1-2 days for zoning; still need structural review (frequently applicants do not provide structural calculations as required)
- colo rooftop: when allowed, issued within 1-2 weeks
- colo bldg: when a zoning review is triggered Type II (staff admin decision) 120 days maximum after complete application
- Towers by right when allowed: zoning sign off within 1-2 weeks
- Towers by CU trigger Type III [public hearing] 120 days maximum after complete application

It typically takes approximately 6 weeks to process a Type II zoning application. State law requires a final decision within a maximum of 120 days after an application is deemed complete.

What are some examples where the local application process resulted in agreement on a different plan from the one originally proposed?

The city has a policy of collocation: carriers are to use existing towers or existing structures to place antennae before erecting new cell towers if at all possible.

N Lombard Street: A carrier applied to construct a new 65' tower in a commercial zone adjacent a neighborhood. Public notice went out and a citizen testified at the hearing that the application should not be processed unless use of adjacent utility poles was infeasible. The carrier did not respond and proceeded to hearing. At the hearing the carrier said it could not use the utility pole but produced no evidence to that effect. The city denied the request because it did not demonstrate compliance with city policy. The carrier then moved the site across the street, where it was able to use a replacement utility pole that gave it more height - 80' - and allowed it to avoid a costly new stand-alone cell tower. The neighbors were able to avoid a new tower, and the carrier was able to gain significant height. This result would not have been possible without adequate time to develop the record and consider the testimony.

08/19/04 Application completed

09/24/04 Staff Report to Hearings Officer

10/06/04 Hearing; record left open to 10/13, with rebuttal due 10/20

10/20/04 Hearing re-opened for new evidence until 11/03

11/10/04 Final rebuttal

11/26/04 Final Decision

99 days Elapsed time. The hearing could not have been reopened with a 75-day shot clock.

SE Milwaukie Avenue: a similar situation occurred where a new cell tower was proposed in a commercial zone adjacent a neighborhood. The cell tower was not built and a 56' utility pole was replaced with a 79' pole for this purpose.

What are some cases where the applicant itself caused delays in the process?

We estimate that when applications are submitted that trigger a zoning review, 30-35% of the applications are incomplete. The missing information can range from the simple (missing site plans or elevations) to more problematic (no narrative addressing the approval criteria, or incomplete applications).

Do you ever resolve an application within 45 or 75 days, as described above? If not, why not? If not all applications are resolved in those time frames, can you explain why it may take more time?

All applications allowed by right are approved in 1-2 days, and building permits issue almost immediately upon submission and approval of any necessary structural calculations.

When zoning review is required, the processing time averages 90 days. State law requires a final decision must be rendered within 120 days of submission of a completed application. See above as to why it can take longer than 75 days.

LIST OF CASES

1. *USCOC of Greater Missouri, LLC v. City of Ferguson, Mo.*, 2007 WL 4218978, *7 (E.D. Mo. 2007) (“As an initial matter, the Court is not willing to find that a four month delay is a per se failure to act in a reasonable time under the TCA”)
2. *Masterpage Communications, Inc. v. Town of Olive*, NY, 418 Fed. Supp.2nd 66 (N.D.N.Y., 2005) (Discussed in the foregoing Opposition at 15)
3. *New York SMSA Ltd. Partnership v. Town of Riverhead*, 2002 WL 2008911, **3 (2nd Cir. 2002) (“Verizon has produced no evidence that the Town has done anything other than attempt to meet the requirements of New York’s environmental law . . .”)
4. *Omnipoint Communications, Inc. v. Common Council of City of Peekskill*, 202 F. Supp.2nd 210, 224 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (“By waiting until after the final decision was rendered, Plaintiff forewent a claim of ‘unreasonable delay,’” citing *Clarkstown*, # 8 below)
5. *Nextel Partners Inc. v. Kingston Tp.*, 286 F.3rd 687, 693 (3rd Cir. 2002) (No “failure to act” because “NPI never applied to the Township for a permit”)
6. *New York SMSA Ltd. Partnership v. Town of Riverhead Town Bd.*, 118 F. Supp.2nd 333, 341 (E.D.N.Y. 2000) (“The statute purposefully uses the term ‘reasonable’ period of time, rather than setting forth an arbitrary time period in which an application must be either approved or denied.”). *See also* # 3 above.
7. *SNET Cellular, Inc. v. Angell*, 99 F.Supp.2nd 190, 198 (D.R.I. 2000) (“Congress did not intend to create arbitrary time tables that force local authorities to make hasty and ill-considered decisions”)
8. *New York SMSA Ltd. Partnership v. Town of Clarkstown*, 99 F.Supp.2nd 381, 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (Plaintiff failed to allege delay until after grant to a competing site)
9. *Sprint Spectrum L.P. v. Zoning Hearing Bd. Of Willistown Tp.*, 43 F.Supp.2nd 534, 539 (E.D. Pa. 1999) (“The Board’s continuance of the hearing was not the result of procrastination nor was it a stratagem to hold up the approval process. Rather, we find that it did so to avoid duplication of effort, jurisdictional problems, and inconsistent decisions”)
10. *National Telecommunications Advisors, LLC v. Board of Selectmen of Town of West Stockbridge* 27 F.Supp.2nd 284, 287 (D. Mass. 1998) (Upheld six-month moratorium, citing *City of Medina* and other cases)

11. *Virginia Metronet, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors of James City County, Va.*, 984 F.Supp. 966, 977 (E.D. Va. 1998) (Finding of insubstantial evidence for denial allowed court not to rule on 14-month delay)
12. *Sprint spectrum L.P. v. Jefferson County*, 968 F.Supp. 1457, 1468 (N.D. Ala. 1997) (Found unreasonable delay in succession of three moratoria, remarking “There is no guarantee the Commission will not again extend its moratorium”)
13. *Illinois RSA No. 3, Inc. v. County of Peoria*, 963 F.Supp. 732, 746 (S.D. Ill. 1997) (“The Court cannot say that taking six months, as compared to three months, is per se unreasonable, and nothing in the record suggests that the County simply ignored or refused to process Plaintiff’s request”)

CEQA and Permit Streamlining

In the County of Los Angeles ("County"), applicants are also required to comply with the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), found at 14 California Code of Regulations sections 15000-15387. Specifically, CEQA establishes a duty for public agencies to regulate proposed activity to avoid or minimize environmental risks or damage, where feasible. If there is a determination that CEQA environmental analysis is required, that process alone will add a minimum of an additional 40 days to allow for statutorily-required public review of that analysis. Then, a public hearing is held, which is scheduled as soon as possible in light of other planning cases before the County. If the Commission were to grant the CTIA Petition to preempt local ordinances and state laws that require wireless service providers to obtain a local zoning approval under the usual processes, the County's ability to verify compliance with State-imposed CEQA requirements would be eviscerated, thus potentially harming local public interests and the environment.

Under a California State law, entitled the Permit Streamlining Act, the County must review an application within 30 days of submission to determine if the application is complete. If the application is deemed complete, the County planning staff then reviews the application to determine appropriate conditions and whether or not recommendation of approval will be made. (It must also comply with CEQA discussed above.) Thereafter, a public hearing is set, which by County code requires 30-days notice, including notice in newspapers which must be submitted to the publisher as much as two weeks before the publication date. Moreover, the hearings are scheduled in light of other planning matters, rather than given priority over other land use matters. If it were to follow these procedures, which it does with all projects, the County could not comply with the Petition's proposed 45-day rule. Even if the only law it had to follow was the Permit Streamlining Act and not CEQA, that would afford the County a mere 15 days to render a decision. Under the improbable scenario proposed by CTIA's Petition, wireless facilities would be placed in front of all other land use decisions regardless of the relative dimension or impact of such projects, would not be given the appropriate level of review and, in many cases, required CEQA review could not be done.